

REMARKS

Claim 25 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 44-46 have been added. Claims 26-29, 38, 42 and 43 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

Election With Traverse

The Examiner contends the claims are directed to two inventions: Group I, claims 18-24, drawn to a method for data processing within an integrated circuit; and Group II, claims 25-29 and 38-43, drawn to a method for testing an integrated circuit. Accordingly, the Examiner has required Applicants to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted. Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement.

Respectfully, as an initial matter, it is submitted that claims 38-43 are not method claims. These claims are directed to an integrated circuit. Additionally, 38-40, 42 and 43 do not expressly require “testing” of an integrated circuit. In the group of claims 38-43, only claim 41 mentions anything about a test routine. As regards claim 38 – this claim is an apparatus claim (integrated circuit) that generally corresponds to claim 18. Applicants have amended claim 38 to make the general correspondence clearer. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should withdraw the present restriction requirement, and, if the Examiner believes that a restriction requirement is in order, to restate the requirement.

In order for the present paper to be considered “responsive,” the Examiner has indicated that Applicants are required to elect a species or invention to be examined, and an identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s identification of species or invention is not clear, considering the Examiner’s misidentification of apparatus claims as method claims, and misidentification of “testing” required by the claims (e.g., claims 38-40, 42 and 43). In any event, Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group I. Assuming that the Examiner meant to describe “Group I” as being drawn to a method/apparatus for data processing, that does not necessarily involving “testing” or a “test routine,” the claims of Group I would be **claims 18-20, 30-36, 40, 42, 43 and 45**. However, it is submitted that claims 21, 26-29, 37, 41, 44 and 46 are dependent claims; thus, these claims should be examined as well.

New Claims

New claims 44-46 have been added. Support for these claims can be found throughout the specification, and within the original claims.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.
Passage to issuance is requested.


The Examiner is invited to contact the below-named attorney at 212-908-6036 for any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 7 Nov 2011

By



Michelle Carniaux
(Reg. No. 36,098)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200